DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 239 764 PS 014 112

TITLE	Achieving Excellence. The Indiana State Board of Education 1984 Legislative Program.
INSTITUTION	Indiana State Dept. of Public Instruction, Indianapolis.
PUB DATE	83
NOTE	34p.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academically Gifted; Adult Education; Basic Skills; Continuing Education; Cost Estimates; *Educational Improvement; Educational Innovation; *Educational Planning; Educational Testing; *Elementary Secondary Education; Incentives; Literacy; Primary Education; Program Costs; *Public Schools; Remedial Programs; *State Boards of Education; Summer Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Full Day Programs; *Indiana; Literacy Tests for Teachers; Project Primetime

ABSTRACT

The Indiana State Board of Education's 1984 legislative program focuses on seven broad aspects of education. Concerning early childhood education, section 1 recommends the expansion of Project Primetime (a program reducing the size of kindergarten, first-grade, and second-grade classes) and the establishment of an incentive system encouraging school districts to offer full-day kindergarten. Section 2 focuses on program recommendations related to the acquisition of basic skills, including a testing and remediation program, an incentive program encouraging high school students to enroll and excell in science and math courses, and programs for adult education. Section 3 contains recommendations for increasing the length of the school year and summer school programs. Section 4 reports plans for the gifted and talented education program, while projects for innovative education are the topic of section 5. Section 6 offers recommmendations concerning teachers; specifically discussed are a functional literacy tests for program entry and out-of-state applicants, and continuing education for teachers. Section 7 presents estimates of the fiscal impact of the 1984 legislative program and of Project Primetime. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED239764

THE INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

1984 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

ACHIEVING EXCELLENCE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Joseph DiLaura
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 014112

Indiana Department of Public Instruction

Harold H. Negley, Superintendent

STATE of INDIANA

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
DR. HAROLD H. NEGLEY, SUPERINTENDENT

INDIANAPOLIS 46204

ROOM 229 - STATE HOUSE
AREA CODE 317 - 232-6612

Dear Friends:

One of my predecessors, Caleb Mills, our second Superintendent of Public Instruction, presented in his address to the members of the 1846 Indiana General Assembly a justification that continues to be the fundamental principle governing any request to support excellence in the schools of Indiana:

> "...The true glory of a people consists in the intelligence and virtue of its individual members, and no more important duty can devolve upon its representatives in their legislative capacity than the devising and perfecting of a wise, liberal, and efficient system of popular education."

Professor Mills also addressed the need for raising adequate revenues, securing competent teachers by means of "suitable normal training, supervision, and better salaries," proper textbooks, "an aroused public interest that would demand and maintain good schools," and a state superintendent to direct the school system. Similar appeals were made in the succeeding addresses of 1847, 1848, 1849, 1850 and 1851. The response to what was known as "the six messages" was made by the 1852 Constitutional Convention by the following in Article 8 of the Constitution of Indiana:

> "Knowledge and learning, generally diffused throughout a community, being essential to the preservation of a free government; it shall be the duty of the General Assembly to encourage, by all suitable means, moral, intellectual, scientific, and agricultural improvement; and to provide, by law, for a general and uniform system of Common Schools, wherein tuition shall be without charge, and equally and open to all."

In the sixth message, Professor Mills takes up the census of 1850 and shows the appalling growth of illiteracy since 1840, citing "instances of some counties whose population has increased fifty per cent, and illiteracy has increased one hundred per cent." Seldom today are we content to meet expectations of conventional literacy, the ability to read, write, and comprehend, at levels judged acceptable in Mills' time.

Today we live in a different age. Literary efforts such as Future Shock, The Third Wave, and Megatrends serve to illustrate the importance of a literate population for not only the present but the future as well. Our focus for the Indiana Common Schools, referenced in the Constitution, includes not only reading and writing, but functional literacy for the tomorrows: skills needed by individuals "to fulfill their own self-determined objectives as family and community members, citizens, consumers, job-holders, and members of social, religious, or other associations of their choosing." To be able to function in a "globalized information economy" is vastly different from the ability

to function in a Conner Prairie Pioneer Settlement's school house. The standards for teachers and instructional materials and the public's expectations for student achievement and elected officals' accountability have also evolved to the present times where there are stark differences. Examples can be given by comparing the requirements established by the Indiana State Board of Education during the past ten years and the 1852 Constitutional Convention. A review of the school curriculum approved in April 1983 and that of the curriculum for Indiana's first high schools indicates that a series of re-evaluations has occurred that has thrust us into an information age characterized by images of the "electronic cottage" and the "robotic factory." What has not changed since the mid-1800's is the on-going task of providing the resources needed to devise and perfect "a wise, liberal, and efficient system of popular education," resources which will allow each citizen the opportunity to function in a complex age and also enable each person to strive toward achieving excellence in his or her life.

The following program for legislative and state board action should be considered only as a step in the on-going process of providing for the schooling needs of the citizens of Indiana. The goal of the plan is to enable each person to learn how to continue to learn and to ensure the existence of knowledge and learning essential to a free government in a rapidly changing world.

Sincerely,

Harold H. Negley

Harold H. Negley
State Superintendent

HHN:jd

CONTENTS

Section I EARLY CHILDHOOD

- Expansion of Project PRIMETIME. 3
- Kindergarten Incentive Program 4

Section II BASIC SKILLS

- Testing and Remediation Program 7
- Math and Science Incentive Program. 8
- Adult Education 10

Section III TIME-ON-TASK

- Increased Length of School Year 15
- Summer School 16

Section IV GIFTED AND TALENTED 21

Section V PROJECTS FOR INNOVATIVE EDUCATION 25

Section VI THE TEACHER AS A PROFESSIONAL

- Functional Literacy Test for Program Entry and Out-of-State Applicants 29
- Continuing Education for Teachers 30

Section VII FISCAL IMPACT 35

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Dr. Harold H. Negley, Chairman

COMMISSION ON GENERAL EDUCATION

Bettye Lou Jerrel
Evansville

Ronald Klene
Indianapolis

Jeanette Moeller
South Bend

T. Randall Tucker
Columbus

COMMISSION ON TEACHER TRAINING AND LICENSING

Brenda Bynum
Elkhart

Mark Caress
Crawfordsville

Warren K. Garner
North Manchester

Robert Hanni
Monticello

James A. Hirschinger
Lafayette

Sue Talbot
Bloomington

COMMISSION ON TEXTBOOK ADOPTIONS

Carol Bottoms
Jeffersonville

Ann Foyer
Carmel

Peggy Hart
Valparaiso

William P. Maxam
Terre Haute

Charlie D. Popplewell
New Castle

Robert Weaver
Fort Wayne

SECTION I

Early Childhood

- Expansion of Project PRIMETIME
- Kindergarten Incentive Program

PROJECT PRIMETIME

Project PRIMETIME, Indiana's experimental program to improve students' basic skills in reading and arithmetic by reducing class size in the critical early-learning grades of K - 2, is now in its third year of operation.

During the first two years of the program, the General Assembly appropriated monies to allow the program to be tested in nine schools and 24 classes across Indiana. In 1983, buoyed by early reports indicating that the reduced class size has led to increased learning, the legislature upped funding to a level at which the program could be administered in 27 schools throughout Indiana. Additionally, a summer school component was added for the 1983 summer school year.

Throughout the first two years of the program, the Department of Public Instruction conducted a series of tests of PRIMETIME students, reviewed extensive teacher records, and conducted scores of interviews with PRIMETIME teachers to test the basic theory of the program.

Three major results emerged from that study:

- PRIMETIME students scored higher on tests than did students in larger classes;

- Discipline and behavior problems were reduced with the lower teacher-pupil ratios;

- Teachers reported increased productivity and effectiveness with the smaller class size.

As a result of this study and other academic research on the effects of class size upon learning, the Department feels very strongly that the Project PRIMETIME program is very successful and warrants implementation on a greater scale across Indiana.

Consequently, the State Board of Education is proposing that increased funding be appropriated for an expansion of Project PRIMETIME. The Board recommends that the Governor and the Superintendent of Public Instruction work to obtain the necessary resources for a greater expansion of the program on a gradual, phased-in basis.

The State Board of Education recognizes that there are a number of options available to accomplish an expansion of PRIMETIME over differing time frames, and suggests that discussions between the Governor's office, the Superintendent's office and the legislative leadership might best determine the appropriate funding program ultimately adopted.

KINDERGARTEN INCENTIVE PROGRAM

The concept of all-day kindergarten is not new. Kindergarten began as an all-day program during the European reform movement of the eighteenth century. Current interest in offering all-day kindergarten as an alternative to the traditional half-day program reflects a quest to provide the best possible programming for children entering public schools.

Of the 39 states responding to an April, 1983 survey, 30 are providing alternatives to the half-day kindergarten. These alternatives include: 1) all-day, every day programs; 2) all-day, every other day programs; and 3) extended-day kindergarten programs.

Hawaii started all-day kindergarten in 1945 and has offered it in all elementary schools since 1955. Florida is the only state, however, which mandates kindergarten by requiring that students successfully complete kindergarten before entering first grade.

It is estimated that 17% of a child's intellectual growth occurs between the ages of four and six. It is during this phenomenal growth period that lasting impressions are created upon personality, physical and mental growth. All-day kindergarten offers a unique option for enriching a child's general learning pattern by providing more personalized instruction and a wider range of learning activities which help children grow in cognitive, psychomotor, affective and linguistic areas.

The State Board of Education recommends that the Department of Public Instruction investigate the establishment of an incentive system to encourage school districts to offer full-day kindergarten. Currently, the State reimburses school districts for kindergarten through a half-day basis. One proposal could be for the state to pay for a percentage of the kindergarten students through a full-day basis. The Department of Public Instruction has estimated costs for differing percentages. Currently, the projected total cost for 1/2 day kindergarten for the '83-84 school year is $40.2 million. If 10% of the children who are currently enrolled in 1/2 day kindergarten were to attend all day, the estimated cost would be an additional 4.0 million dollars.

SECTION II

Basic Skills

- Testing and Remediation Program
- Math – Science Incentive Program
- Adult Education

TESTING AND REMEDIATION PROGRAM

Statewide testing for student competency in basic learning skills has been an issue for many years. In the mid-seventies, however, following a steady decline in pre-college test scores such as the SAT's, members of the public responded with calls for reform and more testing. Thirty-five states, including Indiana, launched educational improvement programs, which included some form of a testing program. A few, such as Florida and Oregon, required the use of a common test, and made graduation from high school contingent upon passing the test.

The State Board of Education is proposing that the 1984 General Assembly consider the establishment of a statewide testing program in reading, writing and math, to be followed by remedial instruction for students who fail the tests.

Testing would be done in three grade levels, which would be set by the State Board of Education. Currently, the Board believes testing should be done in grades 3, 6, and 8, with the follow-up remediation for students who do poorly to take place in grades 4, 7, and 9.

Under this proposal, the State Board of Education would establish the standard for passing as well as criteria for remediation. The proposed legislation estimates a fiscal impact of $400 per student needing remediation. At current salary levels, this funding will support a pupil-teacher ratio of about 10/1 for one class period per day for two semesters. The program under development includes follow-up testing for those who have received two semesters of remedial instruction.

As a companion to follow-up remedial instruction for students who fail to meet minimum standards, the legislature at some future date could fund special follow-up "developmental" instruction for a like number of students to help them meet the challenge standard.

The following cost estimate covers testing, scoring, remediation, and state administration for three grade levels:

BUDGET SUMMARY

	1984/85
Testing and Scoring	$1,519,285
Remediation	306,000*
State Administration	393,750
TOTAL	$2,219,035

*This represents cost of remediation for a limited number of students on a pilot basis. Annual costs of remediation will run approximately $4.5 million per grade, once the program is underway in 1985/86.

MATH AND SCIENCE INCENTIVE PROGRAM

Traditionally, study of high school mathematics and science has been seen as essential only for preparation for careers in science, engineering, and mathematics. Thus, only students who have made an early commitment to careers in these fields or have been intellectually curious have taken more than the basic required courses in these subjects. While more than 70% of Indiana's public school students take algebra and biology, these figures drop rapidly for the more advanced courses where less than 50% take geometry, about 34% take second-year algebra, and 27% take a fourth year mathematics course. The figures are more startling in science where about 30% take chemistry and 12% take physics. A knowledge of physical sciences is fundamental in a high-technology labor force, even in the rapidly expanding biotechnical fields. It is, therefore, clear that by age 15 or 16, when students make high school program choices about further study of mathematics and science, many students have closed their doors to valuable career and occupational options. Consequently, these student decisions, made during adolescence, have provided Indiana with a labor force not always attractive to high-technology industries which in turn places a considerable constraint on the state's economy.

The Board of Education believes that incentives should be provided to encourage students to take as much science and mathematics as they are capable of mastering. Therefore, it is recommended that the 1984 General Assembly create an Indiana Mathematics and Science Scholars Program to be administered by the Indiana Student Assistance Commission which would provide:

- A Certificate and Basic Scholarship Grant for Post-Secondary Education to all Indiana public high school graduates who have taken at least four years of high school mathematics and four years of high school science and received a "B" or better average in their mathematics and science courses.

- A Mathematics and Science Honors Certificate and Scholarship Grant to all those students who received straight "A" semester grades in mathematics and science.

Two optional proposed grant programs are provided for consideration:

Option 1: Basic Grants of $250 per student and Honors Grants of $250; thus giving each "B" student a one-time scholarship of $250 and each "A" student $500.

Option 2: Basic Grants of $100 per student and Honors Grants of $400; thus giving "B" students $100 and "A" students $500.

The following estimated costs were calculated including a 5% administrative cost and based on 1982-83 high school course enrollment in Indiana public schools. The costs are for implementing the program with the high school class of 1984.

More accurate cost figures can be projected when the fall 1983-84 enrollment data are compiled by the Division of Educational Information and Research of the Indiana Department of Public Instruction.

	Basic Grants	Honors Grants	Total Cost
Class of 1984			
Option 1:	$2,600,000	$520,000	$3,120,000
Option 2:	1,050,000	$835,000	1,885,000

ADULT EDUCATION

In today's rapidly changing workplace, it is becoming more and more important to have a literate and adaptable workforce, flexible enough to respond to changing trends as well as new and emerging jobs and careers.

The 1980 census, for instance, found that 34.1% of the adults in Indiana over the age of 25 do not have a high school diploma. And, according to a major literacy study undertaken by the University of Texas in 1975, as many as 1 in 5 adults is functionally illiterate, that is, not competent to perform everyday tasks like reading want ads or filling out job applications.

According to the National Coalition for Literacy, the cost of functional illiteracy exceeds $225 billion in lost industrial productivity, unrealized tax revenues, remedial reading training in business and the military, and crime and welfare costs.

The National Commission on Excellence in Education and other groups have called for the general upgrading of our educational system. Not only is the retraining of the adult population critical to secure the nation's immediate future, but adults also serve as role models and tutors for their children. Additionally, expanded course and "time-on-task" requirements in elementary and secondary school programs will directly affect offerings in and, therefore, the cost of adult basic and secondary education programs.

Yet here in Indiana, existing adult education programs cannot now meet the actual demand for services. Waiting lists exist in most areas of the state. Several school corporations would like to start programs but cannot.

As funding from all sources declined between 1980 and 1982, courses were dropped, class locations were decreased, hours were reduced, and enrollments declined. A slight recovery was experienced in 1982-83, but enrollments last year were nearly 5,000 below the 1980-81 level of 86,000.

A joint effort between DPI and the Governor's office, the "Indiana Adult Literacy Initiative," has been launched. A similar national initiative will be generating attention over the next year. The Indiana plan stresses better coordination of existing resources, greater use of volunteers, and greater corporate support. These components are important adjuncts to a network of adult education professionals, and constitute a good-faith effort to look beyond tax-supported sources. However, such strategies cannot substitute for a major commitment by the public education system.

The State Board of Education is proposing that action be taken in adult education in the following areas:

- The Indiana General Assembly should increase the fiscal year 1984-85 adult education appropriation by $550,000. This will allow expansion of course offerings and hours, accommodation of new enrollments, extension of the program into areas of the state not presently served, and maintenance of services where federal funds have been withdrawn during the first half of the 1984-85 school year. Funding for the remainder of that year will be a part of the next biennial budget.

- The Indiana General Assembly should amend the state statute governing adult education to enable the Commission on General Education to allocate up to 15% of the state appropriation for non-teacher costs.

• The Indiana General Assembly should expand the line item in the State Superintendent of Public Instruction's budget for Management of the Adult Education Program to include the salary and operating expenses for an assistant division director. Five staff consultant positions in the Division have been eliminated since 1980 due to federal and state cutbacks, without a corresponding reduction of responsibilities. Addition of an assistant director would allow routine administrative chores to be shifted to this person, freeing the consultant staff to provide more technical assistance in the areas of program and curriculum development. Other divisions of comparable size and function currently have assistant director positions. This position would be funded at approximately $25,000.

SECTION III

Time-On-Task

- Increased Length of School Year
- Summer School

INCREASED LENGTH OF SCHOOL YEAR

It is difficult to determine the ideal number of school days that should be allocated to student learning: Missouri has 174 days; Indiana, 175 days; New York, 188 days; Colorado, 190 days; and Georgia, 180 days for students and 190 for teachers. What is not difficult to observe, however, is that Indiana lags behind most states in setting the minimum number of days for the school year. In a 1983 survey by the Indiana State Advisory Council on Vocational Education it was reported that only one state, Missouri, had a shorter school year than Indiana's 175 days and that 36 states reported longer school years than Indiana's. Recent national reports indicate that the national school year average is 180 days.

Researchers concerned with factors impacting on student achievement such as quality of curriculum and instruction, individual pupil characteristics such as ability and aptitude, and teacher characteristics, have placed increasing emphasis on total allocated student exposure time and individual pupil attendance. The focus related to alloted time is the pupil's active learning time, often referred to as "time-on-task". While research on the length is sparse, it is reasoned that fewer days mean less time for active learning and greater periods of learning loss. Indiana has struggled for 30 years with the issue of allocating school days, moving from a high-low of 200 days (Special First Class Commission) and 160 days (Certified) in the 1950's, to 180 days overall in 1967, and finally to 175 days in 1972. For schools holding Special First Class Commissions, there are 25 fewer days allocated for learning than there were 30 years ago. It can only be concluded that the lower quantity of schooling means less pupil time-on-task and therefore, less expected pupil achievement.

As a means to bring Indiana in line with the national average, the Board of Education is proposing the expansion of the school year from the current 175 days to 180, the national average, by adding one day each year for the next five years, starting with the 1984-85 school year.

It has been estimated that the fiscal impact of this, at current funding levels, would be approximately $11 million per year.

SUMMER SCHOOL

Indiana's school year of 175 instructional days is among the shortest in the nation and does not allow many students adequate time to master basic learning skills and to be introduced to the critical components of a "broad general education." Summer school has emerged in the past two decades as an important time for many students to be encouraged to achieve their fullest potential. Students' opportunities for a summer school experience were severely reduced in 1981 when the appropriation for summer school programs was reduced by 50 percent (from $5.8 million to $2.9 million).

The State Board of Education recommends an increased appropriation of $10.8 million in FY 85 to allow the Board to approve the following four elements of a summer school program:

Basic Studies Development - Basic studies are those prescribed as requirements for all students in 510 IAC 4-2-2, 4-2-3, 4-2-4, 9-2-3, and 9-2-3.1. In grades K-8, these include language arts, mathematics, social studies/citizenship, science, fine arts, practical arts, health and safety, and motor skills development and physical eduction. At the high school level (grades 9-12), these include language arts, social studies, mathematics, science, health and safety, and basic physical education.

Advancement Studies - Advancement studies are those which provide opportunities in optional areas such as foreign language, in expanded elementary programs in basic study areas, and in advanced programs in the high school.

High Achievement Enrichment Studies - Enrichment studies provide professionally supervised opportunities in independent study and research, special project work, internship or prescribed independent study and reading for the purpose of applying what has been learned during the regular school program.

Alternative Program Studies - Alternative studies provide professionally supervised non-classroom opportunities in community involvement, field trips, camping and travel programs which are designed to enhance physical, social, mental, psychological, and emotional development. (Rule C, Section 2).

A summer school program having the four preceding elements will provide the following benefits:

- Schools will be able to make more extensive use of expensive materials, equipment, and facilities, as well as make more efficient use of teachers employed in high demand subject areas such as math and science.

- Communities will demonstrate to business and industrial leaders responsive and attractive school programs, thereby encouraging the location of new economic ventures in the community.

• Students will be provided these opportunities: to work on needed learning skills and to apply skills and knowledge in real-life settings; to take more advanced courses in interest areas such as math and science; to take courses that were not taken during the regular school year due to scheduling conflicts; and to receive more one-to-one assistance from teachers due to smaller class size.

Guidelines established by the Commission on General Education, Indiana State Board of Education, should reflect a distribution of state funds which provides an estimated 50% for Basic Studies Development and 50% for Advancement Studies, High Achievement Enrichment Studies and Alternative Program Studies. The requested appropriation for FY 1985 is $10.8 million.

SECTION IV

Gifted and Talented

GIFTED AND TALENTED EDUCATION PROGRAM

The Office of Gifted and Talented in the Department of Education uses a 3% to 6% guideline to estimate the potential number of gifted students. Indiana has between 60,000 and 66,000 children who are or can be identified as gifted and talented children. These are children who possess demonstrated or potential abilities that give evidence of high performance capabilities in defined areas (such as: general intellectual, creative, specific academic or leadership ability, or in the performing and visual arts) and who require services or activities not ordinarily provided by the school.

It is an unfortunate fact that an estimated half of the school corporations in the state of Indiana do not have the "means," either in the form of money, trained staff, or instructional supports to meet the educational needs of gifted children. Of the 60-66,000 Indiana gifted and talented students, 40% live in small school corporations who cannot meet the program and service needs of these children. Since gifted and talented students are found in all age groups and socio-economic levels, most of the gifted and talented students in Indiana are not offered a program designed to adequately meet their educational needs. These students should be provided educational opportunities to pursue the most rigorous, demanding and challenging program of studies possible. The intent of this proposal is to provide gifted and talented programs to all potential gifted and talented students in all school corporations, in a consistent and fiscally responsible manner.

The State Board of Education recommends that additional funding (over and above the technical assistance allocation-$500,000 per year) should be provided in FY 85 through a Gifted and Talented funding formula. The additional funding should be distributed through the regular funding formula and should be treated as an expansion of the special education program. To be consistent with current funding and administrative practices, a weight is recommended in the formula of .26. (This is less than 12 of the 13 weights in the formula for special education students.) Twenty other states already include gifted and talented education under the same funding regulations as other special education programs, as is proposed for Indiana.

This proposal includes a cap so that no school corporation could claim more than 5% of its student population as gifted and talented, although some school corporations can already identify up to 6% of their student population. The 5% cap provides a start-up guideline until more experience with gifted and talented programming is possible.

The Department of Public Instruction would monitor the student count by school corporation according to established deadlines for student counts.

The formula devised for funding this program carries the following assumptions:

- Approximately 5% of Indiana students, or 48,200, are identifiable as gifted and talented.
- In the '84 calendar year, Indiana will spend $810 per pupil for the handicapped and vocational education students through a weighted formula.
- The .984 is the local TEI divided by the state TEI which equals the school corporation ratio.
- A weight of .26 is proposed for start-up costs. This weight is proposed as an expansion of the special education weights and is lower than 12 of the 13 current special education weights.

Total Cost Requested: $907.50 x .9850 x 48,200 x .26 = $11,202,198.15

Additional funding should be provided in FY 85 for an Educational Consultant I and one full time clerical staff person to meet the needs of the increased number of school corporations needing technical assistance for gifted and talented programs.

Total Request:	Consultant	$31,250
	Clerical	10,643
		$41,893

Total funding in the area of gifted and talented would thus be approximately $11.24 million.

SECTION V

Projects for Innovative Education

PROJECTS FOR INNOVATIVE EDUCATION

No other period in our history has been characterized by the rapid changes being experienced by our citizens as in the present decade. As indicated in the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, every aspect of our lives is influenced by computers and computer-controlled equipment. Technological development is accelerating and radically transforming our communications, our economic contributions as workers, and our social involvements. As a result, demands for new professional skills and instructional hardware and software have been voiced at all levels of the educational system.

Responding to the rapid change of the "information age", the General Assembly in 1983 established a fund for "special experimental demonstration projects that involve the innovative use of teachers, methods, systems, materials, or programs for preschool, elementary school, or secondary school children that may have a special value in promoting effective educational programs in the state."

Although the General Assembly did not provide any funds in 1983, the Department of Public Instruction was instructed to proceed with the development of a program to carry out the intent of the project in future years.

As such, the State Board of Education proposes that a total of $1.5 million be appropriated by the next session of the General Assembly to proceed with the intent of the program. The department proposes further that the following program for FY 85 be established:

	Proposed Project	Proposed Budget
A.	Designing and implementing curriculum responsive to individual educational needs and learning styles (School Curriculum Improvement).	$300,000
B.	Improving the counseling service to elementary and secondary school children (Counseling and Guidance Services).	$200,000
C.	Providing creative approaches to managing available school time referenced in the curriculum rules of the Indiana State Board of Education instructional-learning time, attendance schedules, school day and school year (Creative Approaches to Scheduling).	$200,000
D.	Providing for staff development (New Approaches To In-Service Training and Staff Development).	$200,000
E.	Responding to local needs in one or more of the project areas identified in the Projects for Innovative Education Law (Special Local Needs).	$600,000
	Total	$ 1,500,000

SECTION VI

The Teacher as a Professional

- Functional Literacy Test for Program Entry and Out-of-State Applicants
- Continuing Education

FUNCTIONAL LITERACY TEST FOR PROGRAM ENTRY AND OUT-OF-STATE APPLICANTS

During the last 2-3 years increased publicity has been given to the quality of current teachers and the quality of students studying to be teachers. A 1982 study published in Phi Delta Kappan indicates that the teaching profession draws a disproportionate number of members of the lower 1/3 of college students reporting SAT scores. Furthermore, the study shows that those with high ability who enter teaching are more likely to leave the profession than those with low ability. Although some may argue the relationship between measured academic ability and performance in the classroom, educators, politicians and policy-makers have demonstrated their belief in such a relationship by considering competency testing for teachers. By 1982, 34 states were either requiring or considering the use of a standardized test to determine graduation from, or admission to, teacher preparation programs.

Indiana has joined the ranks of those states considering a test for teachers as a means to control the quality of individuals graduating from Indiana teacher preparation programs. However, instead of testing at the completion of a teacher preparation program, the state superintendent and the state board of education are promoting testing at entry into the program. Hopefully, this approach will accomplish two things: 1) ensure that candidates for entry into teacher education programs possess at least the basic skills necessary to pursue the teacher education curriculum; and, 2) eliminate the problem of students who have completed their total college program, then fail the test and are denied entry into the profession.

Under the current proposal, all Indiana teacher training institutions will require passage at a common score of a basic skills competency test for admission into the teacher preparation program. The test will be externally prepared, administered, and scored and will include reading, writing, and math skills. Not only will passage of the test be mandatory for Indiana students; all out-of-state applicants for Indiana licensure must take and pass the same exam prior to issuance of a standard Indiana teaching license. This plan is presently scheduled to take effect July 1, 1984.

The Department is recommending the State Board direct the teacher training and Licensing Commission to continue with the:

- Promulgation of the basic skills entry-level test requirement
- Investigation and selection of an appropriate standardized test
- Adoption of guidelines and procedures for Indiana teacher training institutions and out-of-state applicants wishing to take the test.

CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR TEACHERS

Since 1946, with the commencement of the teacher certification rules known as Bulletin 192, Indiana teachers have been required to complete a master's degree and 3 years teaching experience to obtain a professional (life) license. This requirement, which has been maintained through two subsequent revisions of certifications rules, has meant that once a teacher has obtained the professional license, he/she need never pursue additional training. Currently, Indiana has approximately 60,000 teachers, 80% of whom hold life licensure.

During the 1979 session of the Indiana General Assembly, legislation was introduced requiring continuing education for the teaching profession. The bill was assigned to the House Education Committee and received a hearing, but no vote was taken on the proposal. In response to these legislative concerns the Teacher Training and Licensing Commission charged the Teacher Education Advisory Council to study the concept of continuing education as an alternative to the life license in August of that year. In carrying out that charge, the advisory council developed a plan for continuing education and submitted it to the Teacher Training and Licensing Commission in August, 1982. The Commission reaffirmed its endorsement of continuing education, adopted the plan and directed the staff of the Division of Teacher Education and Certification to study the plan with feasibility, ramifications, and details of implementation in mind.

Since August, 1982, not only has continuing education been considered in depth by the Division of Teacher Education and Certification and the Teacher Training and Licensing Commission, but it also has been an item of discussion by numerous education and legislative groups. In the published findings of the Sunset Review Committee Report, the concept of continuing education was not viewed as a cure-all, but was determined to be a feasible first step to controlling the quality of teachers. Although the immediate implementation of a mandatory continuing education plan did not appear appropriate when it was first discussed, the current atmosphere surrounding education indicates that a high interest in such a plan now exists. In response to this interest, the Teacher Training and Licensing Commission, on August 18, 1983, voted to take the proposed plan to public hearing in November, 1983--the first step toward promulgation.

In short, the plan establishes a procedure for continuing education and lifelong professional development for teachers by offering two options to individuals in determining their continued licensure in Indiana. Teachers would be permitted to renew their licenses by taking college or university credit in their subject area(s) or by earning certification renewal units (CRU). CRU's are increments of credit which may be granted for experiences that will aid applicants in maintaining and improving professional capabilities in the areas of licensure. Some of the experiences which may be applicable for CRU's are teaching experience, participation in inservice programs, service on professional committees, publication in professional journals, and supervision of student teachers. This plan would not affect teachers who currently hold life licenses, are currently enrolled in a master's program, or who enroll in a master's program before September 1, 1984, and complete the master's degree before September 1, 1990. It would, however, be in effect for teachers establishing their initial license after September 1, 1984.

The following chart displays the Teacher Training and Licensing Commission proposal for continuing education. The proposal eliminates the opportunity to obtain the life license and provides teachers with two alternatives--Cycles A and B. Steps 1 and 2 of both cycles are identical. Cycle A would then lead to a master's degree with continuing education (pursuit of school services and administrative licenses require the master's degree), and Cycle B would be for continuing education only.

As far as recommendations to be made to the the General Assembly, they are as follows: The State Board should endorse the concept of continuing education and support the Teacher Training and Licensing Commission as it follows the promulgation process; the General Assembly should address itself to the appropriate funding of such a proposal, if indeed, it is serious in its belief that the opportunity to obtain a life license in the future should be eliminated and that continuing education for the profession should be mandated. The projected costs of implementing continuing education are hard to pin down. In completing a cost analysis several assumptions had to be made: 1) since 80% of current teachers in Indiana already have life licensure, the plan will affect a relatively small number of teachers in the first few years; 2) approximately 1,000 new teachers are hired in Indiana each year; 3) all current teachers holding only a bachelor's degree will be enrolled in a master's program by 9-1-84, and will complete the master's degree by 9-1-90, or will lose the opportunity to obtain the life license. Below is the projected fiscal impact. Please note that the per-inservice-hour figure of $11.64 was obtained from Fort Wayne Community Schools, who have a fully operational inservice program already in effect.

School year	Number teachers on continuing education	Total CRU's per year	Inservice Cost*
1989-90**	1,000	36,000	$ 720,324
1990-91	2,000	72,000	1,440,648
1991-92	3,000	108,000	2,160,972
1992-93	4,000	144,000	2,881,296
1993-94	5,000	180,000	3,601,620
1994-95	6,000	216,000	4,321,944

*Does not include administrative costs at local level or state level. Also assumes a 7% inflation rate per year from 1984-1995. Assumes that $18.70 per inservice hour is a realistic cost for 1989-90 inservice programs ($11.64 per inservice hour 1982-83 would increase to $18.70 per inservice hour for 1989-90 based on 7% inflation).

**Div. of TEC is also assuming that the earning of CRU's will begin in earnest during 1989-90 since 1984 graduates who received their first renewals with 6 or 12 hours in 1989 will begin then to earn the CRU's toward their next renewal. We further project that they will earn the total of 180 by completing 36 CRU's yearly for 5 years (see chart for further clarification).

CONTINUING EDUCATION

CYCLE A / CYCLE B

Graduation with a B.S. degree = 5 year teaching license

12 semester hours of approved college coursework = 5 year renewal of license

OR

6 semester hours of approved college coursework + 2 years experience = 5 year renewal of license

(CYCLE A)

M.S. degree + 5 years experience = 10 year license renewal

120 *CRU's + 5 years experience = 5 year license renewal

90 *CRU's = 5 year license renewal

(CYCLE B)

180 *CRU's + 3 years experience = 5 year license renewal

180 *CRU's + 3 years experience = 5 year license renewal

90 *CRU's + 3 years experience = 5 year license renewal

CYCLE A / CYCLE B

90 *CRU's will be required each 5 years for both Cycle A and Cycle B

Who will be affected?

Anyone who has not been admitted to a M.S. program by September 1, 1984 and does not have a life license.

Who will not be affected?

1. Anyone who has a Life license or is currently eligible for such a license.

2. Anyone who is admitted to a M.S. program prior to September 1, 1984 and completes the degree before September 1, 1990.

*CRU = Certification Renewal Unit - an increment of credit which may be granted for experiences that will aid applicants in maintaining and improving professional capability. Examples of CRU's: college credit, supervising of student teachers and early field experiences, workshops, inservice meetings, serving as member of accreditation teams, publication of articles, travel related to licensure area, et al.

SECTION VII

Fiscal Impact

ESTIMATED FISCAL IMPACT*

1984 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Program	Cost
PRIMETIME	See narrative below
Kindergarten Incentive Program	$4.0 to 20.0 million depending on Board and Legislative action
Testing and Remediation	$2.21 million
Math and Science Incentive	Option 1: $2.6 million Option 2: $1.05 million
Adult Education	$575,000
Increased Length of School Year	$11.0 million
Summer School	$10.8 million
Gifted and Talented	$11.2 million
Innovative Education	$1.5 million
Functional Literacy Test for New Teachers	Test Cost Only
Continuing Education	No fiscal impact until 1989-90 school year

*All costs are for the 1984-85 school year only.

PROJECT PRIMETIME FISCAL IMPACT

The fiscal impact of an expansion of Project PRIMETIME will obviously be related to the pupil-teacher ratio adopted as well as how many grades the program is expanded to in the first year.

There are obviously numerous combinations and options for the Educational Leadership and General Assembly to consider. Listed below are three charts summarizing some of these.

CHART: A

PUPIL/TEACHER RATIOS						
	From Current to 20/1		From 20/1 to 18/1		From 18/1 to 15/1	
	Year Implemented 84-85		Year Implemented 85-86		Year Implemented 86-87	
	Additional Teachers Required	Cost	Additional Teachers Required	Cost	Additional Teachers Required	Cost
First Grade	545	$ 11,422,277	422	$ 9,289,908	814	$ 18,815,610
Second Grade	633	13,262,253	383	8,431,362	788	18,214,620
Third Grade	617	12,926,587	392	8,629,488	754	17,428,710
TOTAL	1,795	$ 37,611,117	1,197	$ 26,350,758	2,356	$ 54,458,940

On the chart above, the Additional Teachers Required data have been rounded to the nearest whole teacher within each individual school corporation, and therefore, the total. This means that if less than a half-time teacher is required, a teacher would not be hired, and class size would be increased somewhat; but if, at minimum, a half-time teacher is required, another teacher would be hired, and class size reduced further.

The chart shows additional costs for reducing class sizes in increments over a three year period starting in 1984-85. Average teacher salary in 1982-83 plus a five percent (5%) increase in salary for each year between 1982-83 and the year the reduction is instituted was used to calculate costs. No costs for additional supplies, capital outlay, or employer taxes have been calculated. Enrollments for 1982-83 were used with no increase or decrease calculated for ensuing years.

CHART: B

PUPIL/TEACHER RATIOS						
	First Grade 1984-85		Second Grade 1985-86		Third Grade 1986-87	
	Additional Teachers Required	Cost	Additional Teachers Required	Cost	Additional Teachers Required	Cost
15/1 Ratio	1,746	$ 36,602,443	1,781	$ 39,208,255	1,729	$ 39,957,514
18/1 Ratio	945	19,808,677	1,002	22,048,342	990	22,873,448
20/1 Ratio	545	11,422,277	634	13,947,190	620	14,320,898

On the chart above, the Additional Teachers Required data have been rounded to the nearest whole teacher within each individual school corporation, and there-

fore, the total. This means that if less than a half-time teacher is required, a teacher would not be hired, and class size would be increased somewhat; but if, at minimum, a half-time teacher is required, another teacher would be hired, and class size reduced further.

Rather than taking the incremental approach, as in Chart A, this chart shows the costs of reducing pupil/teacher ratios for one grade each year at either a ratio of 15/1, 18/1, or 20/1. Average teacher salary in 1982-83 plus a five percent (5%) increase in salary for each year between 1982-83 and the year the reduction is instituted was used to calculate costs. No costs for additional supplies, capital outlay, or employer taxes have been calculated. Enrollments for 1982-83 were used with no increase or decrease calculated for ensuing years.

CHART: C

PUPIL/TEACHER RATIOS						
	Pupil/Teacher Ratio 15/1		Pupil/Teacher Ratio 18/1		Pupil/Teacher Ratio 20/1	
	Additional Teachers Required	Cost	Additional Teachers Required	Cost	Additional Teachers Required	Cost
First Grade	1,746	$ 34,860,134	945	$ 18,865,766	545	$ 10,878,566
Second Grade	1,781	35,564,206	1,002	19,999,150	634	12,650,926
Third Grade	1,729	34,517,484	990	58,624,250	620	12,371,174
TOTAL	5,256	$ 104,941,824	2,937	$ 58,624,250	1,799	$ 35,900,666

On the chart above, the Additional Teachers Required data have been rounded to the nearest whole teacher within each individual school corporation, and therefore, the total. This means that if less than a half-time teacher is required, a teacher would not be hired, and class size would be increased somewhat; but if, at minimum, a half-time teacher is required, another teacher would be hired, and class size reduced further.

The chart shows what the cost would be for the school year 1983-84 if class sizes were reduced. Average teacher salary for 1982-83 plus a five percent (5%) increase was used to calculate costs. No costs for additional supplies, capital outlay, or employer taxes have been calculated. Enrollments for 1982-83 were used with no increase or decrease calculated.